

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-20 in the application. Previously, the Applicant amended Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8-9, 13, 15-16, 18 and 20. In the present response, the Applicant has not amended, added or canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 11-12, 14-16, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 11-12, 14-16, 18 and 19 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,872,481 to Sevic, *et al.*, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,027,003 to Haight, *et al.* The Applicant respectfully disagree. As recognized by the Examiner, the AAPA in view of Sevic does not teach or suggest selecting a voltage level to apply across a driver stage of a line driver to provide a power level as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. To cure this deficiency, the Examiner cites Haight. (*See Examiner's Action*, page 3.)

Haight relates to switching an amplified source component in order to either read or write thereto. (*See column 1, lines 6-9.*) Haight discloses a read/write configuration including an amplifier 58, a power supply switching circuit 66, having an electronic switch S3, and a control circuit 68. In response to a control signal, the control circuit 68 will operate switch S3 to either apply or not apply a supply voltage to the amplifier 58. (*See column 3, line 42, to column 4, line 34, and Figure 2.*)

Haight, however, provides no teaching or suggestion of selecting a voltage level to apply across a driver stage of a line driver. In fact, Haight does not even disclose multiple voltage levels to

select to apply to the amplifier 58. On the contrary, Haight discloses connecting or disconnecting a single voltage supply to the amplifier 58. In other words, Haight makes no decision on what voltage supply to apply to the amplifier 58 but instead decides on when to connect the single voltage supply to the amplifier 58.

Thus, Haight does not teach or suggest selecting a voltage level to apply across a driver stage and does not cure the noted deficiency of the AAPA and Sevic. The cited combination of the AAPA, Sevic and Haight, therefore, does not teach or suggest each element of independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 and does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness thereof. As such, the cited combination does not render obvious Claims 1, 8 and 15 and Claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection and allow issuance for Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 11-12, 14-16, 18 and 19.

Additionally, even assuming that Haight does teach selecting a voltage level to apply across a driver stage, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the teaching of Haight with Sevic. Sevic selects appropriate amplifier stages of an amplifier circuit that are necessary to provide a desired level of output power. (See the Abstract, lines 6-10.) Thus, Sevic obtains a desired output level by selecting amplifier stages and has no need to employ selecting a voltage level to apply across a driver stage.

Furthermore, Haight and Sevic are directed to different problems and one skilled in the art would not be motivated to look to the other one for assistance. Sevic is directed to providing efficient linear amplification over a wide dynamic range. (See column 1, lines 13-15, and column 2, lines 14-29.) Haight is directed to reducing the negative effects of mechanical connections for bidirectional read/write schemes. (See column 1, lines 11-39.) Thus, one skilled in the art would not

look to Haight from Sevic for assistance in solving the problem addressed by Sevic and one would not look to Sevic from Haight for assistance in solving the problem addressed by Haight.

II. Rejection of Claims 3, 6, 10, 13, 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3, 10 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Sevic, Haight and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 3,755,693 to Lee and Claims 6, 13 and 20 as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Sevic, Haight and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 3,961,280 to Sampei. As discussed above, the cited combination of AAPA and Sevic do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. Additionally, the Applicant does not find where Lee or Sampei teach or suggest each element of amended independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. More specifically, the Applicant does not find where either Lee or Sampei teach or suggest selecting a voltage level to apply across a driver stage of a line driver as recited in Claims 1, 8 and 15. Additionally, neither Lee nor Sampei have been cited to teach the subject matter of independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 but to teach the subject matter of the above-identified dependent claims. As such, the cited combinations of AAPA, Sevic and Haight with Lee or Sampei, do not teach or suggest each and every element of dependent Claims 3, 10 and 17 or dependent Claims 6, 13 and 20, respectively. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 3, 6, 10, 13, 17 and 20 and allow issuance thereof.


III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-20.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC


J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: May 22, 2006

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800